

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-19 are pending in the present application. New claims 18 and 19 have been added.

Claim Objections

Claim 7 has been objected to because of some informalities.

Claim 7 has been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, to overcome this objection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2 and 4-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hyon (U.S. 2002/0077135) in view of Baker (USP 6,546,417), and further in view of Ostermann et al. (USP 6,990,452). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants assume that the Examiner has intended to reject claim 3 rather than claim 2 because claim 2 has been canceled in the Reply filed on December 26, 2007.

In page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Hyon fails to disclose:

- H) said image transforming means that scales up/down said registered image in accordance with said attribute data; and
- I) so that a size of said registered image matches said character size of said text

Therefore, the Examiner relies on the Baker reference and alleges that it discloses these features by referring to the statements in col. 8, lines 26-40 of Baker.

Baker states, in col. 8, lines 26-40:

in order to accommodate the use of different size fonts in the mailbox display, means for scaling the size of the icon graphics are also provided . . . at least one image for each icon is stored, the icon most closely matching the point size of the font is chosen and then scaled as needed to better match the font point size.
(emphasis added)

Therefore, in Baker, the size of the icon graphics is scaled by (i) selecting an icon most closely matching the point size of the font; and (ii) the selected icon is further scaled as needed to better match the font point size.

Baker, however, does not disclose or suggest that the size of the icon graphics is scaled by adjusting “a width of said registered image to a width of said text, serving as a reference,” as recited in claim 1. This feature of the present invention is disclosed in page 12, lines 2-4 of the specification of the present application.

The Examiner relies on the Ostermann reference to show that sandwiching a registered image between two parts of a text is known in the art.

Therefore, even assuming that Hyon, Baker and Ostermann can be combined, which Applicants do not admit, Hyon, Baker, and Ostermann, taken singly or in combination fail to disclose or suggest the foregoing feature recited in claim 1.

Claims 3-5 and 9-14, variously dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 1.

Independent claims 6, 7, and 8 are allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 1.

Claim 15, dependent on claim 6, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 6.

Claim 16, dependent on claim 7, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 7.

Claim 17, dependent on claim 8, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 8.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

New Claims

Claims 18 and 19 are allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 1.

Support for the features recited in these claims is disclosed in page 11, lines 2-21 of the specification ("In step S14 in Fig. 4, CPU 10 scales up/down the image T_y/I_y fold, where T_y is a height of the text while I_y is a height of the image.").

A favorable determination by the Examiner and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion


Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi Reg. No. 40,417 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 31, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By  (reg. # 40,417)
Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant